

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----x
SEHRA WAHEED, :
Plaintiff, : 25-CV-358 (PAE) (OTW)
-against- :
ORDER
BALLON STOLL BADER AND NADLER PC, et al., :
Defendants. :
-----x

ONA T. WANG, United States Magistrate Judge:

The Court received two emails Monday night (at 9:55 p.m. and 10:39 p.m.) from Plaintiff Sehra Waheed (“Plaintiff”), who is self-represented. Each email is addressed three times to the email address for self-represented parties to file documents with the Court (the “Pro Se Filings email”) and contains PDF attachments that are, presumably, the documents Plaintiff wishes to file. The emails are also addressed to my Chambers and Judge Engelmayer’s Chambers, and also (apparently) to individual defendants Bellovin, Haroutunian, Brunson, Bildirici (twice), and their counsel, Ms. Tattersall.

Plaintiff is directed not to email or copy judges on any future correspondence or Court filings. My Individual Practices and Judge Engelmayer’s Individual Rules of Practice do not permit self-represented parties to email chambers directly; indeed, even counseled parties are not to send correspondence to chambers by email, and letters must be filed electronically on

ECF.¹ The Court will address requests and issues raised in filings only when they appear on the docket.

Plaintiff's emails also apparently copied individual defendants who are represented by counsel. Lawyers and *pro se* litigants should not communicate directly with people who are represented by counsel, unless their counsel consents or they are "authorized to do so by law or a court order." N.Y. R. Prof. Conduct 4.2(a). Plaintiff is directed to communicate with represented parties through their counsel and should not email them directly.

Yesterday morning, Judge Engelmayer and I received another email from "Josef Bildirici" that appeared to be a "reply to all," except that the number of recipients inexplicably increased from 11 to 14, and Plaintiff's attachments appear to still be attached. The Pro Se Filings email is now listed five times, and individual defendant Hartounian is now copied twice. Defendant Bildirici is copied twice, at two different email addresses that were different from the sender address for "Josef Bildirici." The text of the email reads, in its entirety:

Sehra ,
 I think you can make so much money as a lawyer or lawyer assistant . All these legal paper you spend yr time , you can really realy make use in a law firm and make real money ..
 Sent from my iPhone
 Best Regards
 J.B

¹ My Individual Practices are available here:

https://www.nysd.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/practice_documents/OTW%20Wang%20Individual%20Practices%20April%202025.pdf. Judge Engelmayer's Individual Rules of Practice in Civil Cases are available here: https://nysd.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/practice_documents/PAE%20Engelmayer%20Updated%20Individual%20Rules%20of%20Practice%20in%20Civil%20Cases%20%282021%20April%29%20.pdf. Judge Engelmayer's Individual Rules of Practice in Civil Pro Se Cases are available here: https://nysd.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/practice_documents/PAE%20Engelmayer%20IndividualRulesOfPracticeInCivilProSeCases%20.pdf.

Defendant Bildirici is represented by Ms. Tattersall. **Defendant Bildirici and his counsel are directed to file a single letter on the docket, by 5:00 p.m. on May 16, 2025, addressing the following issues:**

- 1) Whether this email in fact originated from Bildirici;
- 2) Whether the Court should have the email entered on the docket; and
- 3) Whether the Court should consider this email to be a response to Plaintiff's proposed filings.

All parties are hereby directed to stop copying the Court on email correspondence and proposed filings. No "courtesy copies" of filings should be sent to the Court unless the Court has specifically directed them to be sent. Future emails will be discarded without review, and future failure to follow these directions may result in sanctions on the party responsible.

The Court certifies under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this Order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore IFP status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *Cf. Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962) (holding that appellant demonstrates good faith when seeking review of a nonfrivolous issue).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 14, 2025
New York, New York

s/ Ona T. Wang
Ona T. Wang
United States Magistrate Judge